

City of Springfield
Work Session Meeting

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
SPRINGFIELD ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AGENCY
HELD MONDAY, OCTOBER 4, 2004

The Springfield Economic Development Agency met in the Jesse Maine Meeting Room, 225 Fifth Street, Springfield, Oregon, on Monday, October 4, 2004 at 6:00 p.m., with Board Member Sid Leiken calling the meeting to order.

ATTENDANCE

Present were Board Members Sid Leiken, Anne Ballew, Tammy Fitch, Christine Lundberg and John Woodrow. Also present were City Manager Mike Kelly, Economic Development Manager John Tamulonis and City Recorder Amy Sowa.

Board Member Dave Ralston was absent (excused).

Mr. Tamulonis said the governing body of the City of Springfield acts as the board for the Springfield Economic Development Agency (SEDA). This board is a separate agency from the City of Springfield. He explained the order of the agenda and the items up for discussion. The Agency determined they would like to elect the Board Chair as their first order of business.

IT WAS MOVED BY BOARD MEMBER WOODROW WITH A SECOND BY BOARD MEMBER LUNDBERG TO ELECT BOARD MEMBER FITCH AS CHAIR OF THE SPRINGFIELD ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AGENCY. THE MOTION PASSED WITH A VOTE OF 5 FOR AND 0 AGAINST (1 ABSENT - RALSTON).

Board Chair Fitch presided over the remainder of the meeting.

APPROVAL MINUTES

COMMUNICATIONS

1. Business from the Audience

Dave Carvo, 4010 East 16th, Eugene, OR Mr. Carvo is a resident of Glenwood. Because the Urban Renewal District directly affects Glenwood, he is very concerned that there are no residents of Glenwood on this board. This is Glenwood's neighborhood and their tax dollars that will be diverted for this district. This is not taxation with representation. He asked how this board works.

Mr. Tamulonis said those living within the city limits in Glenwood are represented by the City Council as the Urban Renewal Agency Board. Those in Glenwood who live outside the city limits, but within the urban growth boundary (UGB), are represented by the Lane County Board of Commissioners. The Board of Commissioners will make the determination whether or not the area outside city limits would be included in the Urban Renewal District (URD).

Mr. Carvo asked if this would then be two districts.

Mr. Tamulonis said it would only be one district. There is an area under ORS457 that states that if a district goes into another jurisdiction that is not represented by the governing body of the district, it needs to be approved by the governing body of that entity, which is Lane County Board of Commissioners.

Mr. Carvo asked if the vote going before Springfield voters relates only to the area that is currently annexed into the City of Springfield

Mr. Tamulonis said that is correct. For the City Council to approve this district, it must be approved by the voters of Springfield for the areas annexed in the city.

Mr. Carvo said that had not been clear throughout these proceedings. He asked if the intent was to have one district by two jurisdictions.

Mr. Tamulonis said that is what is being proposed.

Mr. Carvo asked if there would be additional members on this board if Springfield voters were to pass the district in areas within the city limits. He asked if there would be additional members representing those outside the city limits.

Mr. Kelly said the city is asking voters on November 2 to approve the use of urban renewal and tax increment because that is the city's charter requirement. If the voters approval the URD, the district would have the right to use urban renewal funds, activities and powers in Glenwood. The detailed plan and project list would then be prepared and finalized. The final plan and project list would be taken to Lane County for their approval. If Lane County Board of Commissioners does not approve it, the district would be amended to include only areas within the Springfield city limits in Glenwood. If Lane County does approve, the URD could go forward for all areas in Glenwood with the current SEDA board. Lane County may say they would like one or two representative on the board. Even though we may be dealing with property that is initially unincorporated, through SEDA it would have to be annexed before it was developed. In the end it would be part of the Springfield city limits.

Mr. Carvo said the tax dollars from the unincorporated portion of Glenwood would go to the SEDA projects, approved by the county, and possibly their representation could be proxied to the SEDA board.

Mr. Kelly said it would be up to Lane County to decide if they wanted representation on the board and which projects to select.

Mr. Tamulonis said there would be a Planning Commission work session on urban renewal on Tuesday, October 5.

Mr. Carvo said urban renewal is a great thing when it is managed well and for the good of the community. He has support for that. He said that even if the county does not choose to have representation on the SEDA board, he would ask that the SEDA board make the decision to have representation from the county. He referred to the Mayor's comments about working with the citizens of Glenwood regarding this district.

Board Chair Fitch said the board would take that under consideration, but it is premature until after the election.

Mr. Tamulonis referred to the discussions Board Chair Fitch initiated and held with Glenwood residents regarding the district.

Mr. Carvo said there is a distinction between citizens and residents of Glenwood and commercial property owners who do not live in Glenwood.

Mr. Tamulonis confirmed that both groups have been included in discussions.

2. Correspondence

3. Business from the Staff

REPORT OF CHAIR

OLD BUSINESS

NEW BUSINESS

1. Reconvening of the Springfield Economic Development Agency to Elect Chair, Review Mission Statement, and Authorizing Forwarding of the Glenwood Urban Renewal Plan to the Springfield Planning Commission.

Economic Development Manager John Tamulonis presented the report on this item. At the August 16, 2004 Special Meeting, council approved the ballot measure that would, if approved, allow the City Council to approve the Glenwood Urban Renewal Plan. The city's existing Urban Renewal Agency has not met since the late 1980s, but would need to meet to consider the draft Glenwood Urban Renewal Plan and Report and conduct the city's business regarding urban renewal plans, public involvement, policies, activities, projects, etc. Should the Glenwood Urban Renewal Plan be adopted, SEDA would conduct the agency's business with regular meetings.

SEDA's mission statement (Attachment 1 included in the agenda packet) and adopted goals were formed to provide general guidance to the very detailed urban renewal plan proposed at that time. That mission and goals do not reflect the more complex issues that may be part of proposed Glenwood Urban Renewal District (regarding river frontage; mixed-use development; protecting health of residents, neighborhoods, and environment; fostering a major development, etc) over the next 20 years of its operation. Staff is looking for guidance on any modifications to be brought back to SEDA for adoption.

Attachment 2 included in the agenda packet provides details on the formation and legal requirements of formulating and approving an urban renewal plan. ORS 457.085(4) requires that an urban renewal plan be forwarded to the municipality's planning commission prior to presenting the plan to the governing body of the municipality for approval. City Council would not have that opportunity until after the November election. And, because a portion of the proposed Plan remains outside the city limits, Lane County would also need to approve the Plan prior to the City Council's approval. Lane County has expressed a willingness to consider approving the Plan provided it can partner on some Lane County projects in Glenwood.

Springfield Planning Commission will have a Work Session briefing on urban renewal October 5, 2004 and can review the proposed Glenwood Plan with public notice at its October 19, 2004 meeting. A draft Glenwood Urban Renewal Plan and Report will be available for the SEDA meeting on October 4, 2004 for initial review. The SEDA Board could forward the draft onto the Planning Commission at that time, instruct staff to begin the notice for the Planning Commission's considering the Plan at its October 19, 2004 meeting, and/or provide staff with additional instructions so SEDA can meet again and provide modifications to the draft Plan.

Mr. Tamulonis distributed the SEDA Mission Statement with updates that have been noted by underlines and strikeouts. He described some of those updates and the reason for those changes.

Discussion was held regarding residential and mixed-use activities and how they relate to the Glenwood Refinement Plan.

Board Chair Fitch asked if there were separate by-laws for SEDA.

Mr. Tamulonis said there are by-laws and he will bring them to the next meeting.

Board Member Ballew said the plan is too ambitious and should focus more on economic development instead of housing assistance. There are federal programs to assist with housing.

Mr. Tamulonis said he tried to include a way to mitigate some of the problems associated with sanitary sewer/septic systems. If there are problems, we currently do not have a way to use federal funds through the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) to help with those issues. They would hope to set up a similar program that would be internal to the Urban Renewal Agency that might allow those loans that are paid back once the property changes hands, much like the housing rehabilitation loans. That might allow some of those septic issues to be resolved, so it would not be borne by low-income residents.

Board Member Ballew said it may not be an appropriate use of those funds. It is a difficult position for residents, but she does not feel urban renewal funds are the appropriate source.

Board Member Leiken asked if Mr. Tamulonis and other staff members had met with the county. They have. He asked if the county had given staff an indication regarding the goals that are listed on the draft plan such as the housing issue.

Mr. Tamulonis said he and Mr. Grile met with the county. There were a couple of commissioners who were concerned about the district having an adverse affect on the residential development, particularly for things that might propose choices for people who couldn't afford some of the things necessary if development occurred. They didn't want the district to change the neighborhood or the character forcing residents to relocate outside the area. That is why some of the projects were added.

Mr. Grile said when they met with the county they discussed urban renewal as a possible way to assist with the septic sewer issue.

Board Member Lundberg confirmed this was just a first look at this plan and they were not approving anything.

Mr. Tamulonis said it was entirely up to the board. If they were happy with it, they could move ahead. If they had concerns, staff could make those changes and bring it back.

Board Member Lundberg said the plan was too much and should be divided better. She suggested more clarification on the term housing. She understands that the county has asked that the district assist in housing efforts. She would like to see a better definition regarding the term housing.

Board Member Woodrow said these are goals that we can strive for, but does not limit us to having to do these things.

Board Member Ballew said she understand that this is a list of what the district plans to do and she doesn't feel it should deal with housing rehabilitation. Relocation assistance may be appropriate. Those residents that are not in the city should not be assisted.

Mr. Tamulonis said the URD would be in place for twenty years which is a long time to plan. This could be adjusted at any time. He noted that any projects would be approved under the board's direction. It is similar to the block grant program regarding approval. Once adopted, the plan shows what could be done, not what must be done. The board could define the programs along the way.

Board Member Ballew said she doesn't want to set out an expectation that she does not plan to support.

Board Member Woodrow suggested asking staff to bring back several options with the suggestions mentioned by Board Members Lundberg and Ballew. He recommended that all Board Members give Mr. Tamulonis their suggestions during the week.

Board Chair Fitch said there may be a compromise. The primary focus is creating jobs and the business climate. She said the board needs to see the by-laws at their next meeting, as they may also need updating.

Mr. Tamulonis said he would also get a copy of the initiating ordinance. He invited council to send their suggestions through email, phone calls or personal visits. The board needs to meet prior to the election and will have a series of short meetings. Mr. Tamulonis asked Board Members to read the draft plan which is included in the notebooks he distributed. He discussed the programmed approach of the Urban Renewal Agency. He described the magnitude of this district and the number of options. The district is a funding mechanism to allow the projects to be built. The goals are ambitious, but twenty years is a long time to accomplish those goals.

Board Chair Fitch suggested Board Members get their options or suggestion to Mr. Tamulonis by the end of the week. She asked if they could meet again next Monday.

Mr. Tamulonis said they could meet briefly next Monday, October 11. He asked the board if they could direct staff to put out the first notice for the Planning Commission to review a draft plan. The notice needs to get out early as it is a land use action. The Planning Commission will hold their work session to discuss this item on Tuesday, October 5.

IT WAS MOVED BY BOARD MEMBER WOODROW WITH A SECOND BY BOARD MEMBER LUNDBERG TO DIRECT STAFF TO PUT OUT THE FIRST NOTICE FOR THE

PLANNING COMMISSION TO REVIEW A DRAFT PLAN. THE MOTION PASSED WITH A VOTE OF 5 FOR AND 0 AGAINST. (1 ABSENT – RALSTON)

Mr. Tamulonis asked the board to review the plan and make edits and changes as they see fit. He would be happy to meet with any of the board members anytime to discuss the plan. The last thing in the notebook is a fold-out which includes some of the proposed projects. The projects are not much different than the board saw in their role as City Council in their council briefings. It includes other organizations that would be involved regarding costs.

RESOLUTIONS

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 6:31 pm.

Minutes Recorder – Amy Sowa

Tamalyn Fitch
SEDA Chair

Attest:

Amy Sowa
City Recorder